



Examiner
12403
4 Amor
A

PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10407/640

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Cole et al.

Serial No.: 09/904,061 Examiner: Corbett B. Coburn

Filed: July 12, 2001 Group Art Unit: 3714

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ALLOWING
UNINTERRUPTED GAMING

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
NOV 28 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of May 12, 2003, and is timely filed with a three-month extension.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Claims 1-50 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,505,461). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,505,461). Claims 11-19, 22-25, 27-33, 35-44, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Acres (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,333). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Bell et al., and further in view of Bergeron et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,882,473) and Pease et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,326,104). Claims 20, 21, 26, 34, 45, 46, and 48-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Acres (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,333), and further in view of Bergeron et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,882,473) and Pease et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,326,104). The Abstract has been objected to due to its length. The title has been objected to as not descriptive. The drawings have been objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Atty Docket No.: 10407/640
Serial No. 09/904,061

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-17, 19-21, 23-36, 40-42, and 44-46 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 48-50 have been deleted. Figure 1A has been added, and the specification has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected specification and claims. Applicant respectfully contends that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art.